

NORTH-WESTERN CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

HE THAT DOETH TRUTH COMETH TO THE LIGHT, THAT HIS DEEDS MAY BE MADE MANIFEST,
THAT THEY ARE OF GOD.—*Messiah.*

VOL. III. CINCINNATI, OCTOBER, 1856.

No. 4.

Christian System.—No. 10.

One of the most conclusive evidences that the christian religion is of Divine origin, is its perfect adaptation to man, not only viewed as a rebel against the great Jehovah, but also adapted to his organism physically, intellectually, and morally. The duties and obligations which it enjoins upon its votaries are not only wisely designed to benefit man as the result of this obedience, but they are so arranged as to harmonize with every attribute of his nature.

In no particular instance is this truth more strikingly illustrated than in the Heaven-ordained arrangement which enjoins upon christians, the singing of "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs making melody in their hearts to the Lord."

The love of music is almost co-extensive with the habitable earth. It is not confined to the boundaries of civilization. The most benighted nations of the earth give unmistakable evidence that they love it, and that it exercises a mighty influence even on their untutored minds. Truly has the poet said "Music hath charms to soothe the sav-

age breast." Even the brute creation are not insensible to its charms, and if our space would allow it, we could adduce the most striking anecdotes in illustration of the fact. Even mice have been allured from their hiding places, attracted by the soft melody of the flute and the guitar. If the voice of the living speaker has a power over the hearers which cannot be imparted to a written composition when read by a third person, that voice when tuned to the measured notes of music will touch a chord which no inharmonious sound could reach.

There is no department of society in which music, and especially *vocal*, may not be profitably introduced. Its almost universal tendency is to soften the heart, to calm the passions, and to produce in the mind serenity and peace. Hence its beneficial effects in the school room, in the social circle, and especially at the family altar. We doubt whether the person whose "soul is full of music," and who engages frequently in the Heaven-born exercise of tuning the voice in praise to the great Creator of the universe, can ever become as de-

praved as others who are callous to its charms. Who is there that has not felt its tranquilizing effects on the soul when care-worn and sad they have retired from the toils and strife of the sterner realities of life, and in the stillness of evening poured forth their song of devotion? Who that has been reared at the hearth-stone where God's name was wont to be honored, and His mercies remembered, but looks back with the most pleasing emotion to

"The hymn of thanksgiving with harmony swelling
All warm from the heart of the family band,
That raised them from earth to that rapturous dwelling
Described in the Bible that lay on the stand?"

Who by joining in the congregational song of praise, has not felt an expansion of soul, and a dispersion of that listlessness, that apathy and that cold formality, which are so prejudicial to a profitable waiting upon God in the institutions of His house?

In the sacred scriptures, the idea of happiness is always connected with that of music, and it is in accordance with universal experience that singing is not only a suitable manner of expressing our happiness, but also one of the best means of producing it. "Is any merry?" says an apostle, "let him sing psalms." At the dawn of time, when nature was first gladdened by the creative power of Jehovah, we are told "The morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." On the banks of the Red sea, when they had been delivered from Egyptian slavery, and witnessed the destruction of the host of Pharaoh, the emancipated multitude gave expression to their emotions of joy by *singing*. "Then sang Moses, and the children of

Israel this song unto the Lord, and spake, saying, I will sing unto the Lord for he hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider, hath he thrown into the sea. The Lord is my strength and song, and he has become my salvation: he is my God, and I will prepare him an habitation; my father's God, and I will exalt him." Again at the well of Beer, where was slaked the thirst of those whom Moses led on to the promised Canaan, the voice of that vast multitude was heard in songs of praise and thanksgiving. Indeed singing the praises of God seems to have been a prominent part in the exercises of those who were his true worshipers, and we learn that it will hold a prominence in the employment of those who are so happy as to gain admittance into the heavenly Canaan, and become citizens of the "New Jerusalem."

Our present enquiry is with regard to the proper performance of the exercise in the congregation. How as christians shall we in a congregated capacity, sing acceptably to God and profitably to ourselves? It is just as true of singing as it is of preaching or any other action that duty requires us to perform, that "there is no excellence without labor," and it is a truth, although to some it may appear strange, that the two extremes which are witnessed in congregational singing, are both the result of an aversion to that laborious preparation, necessary to a proper personal and individual performance of it. In those congregations where the singing is wholly performed by a *vaid* choir, composed frequently, at least in part, of those who make no pretensions to christianity, no matter

how scientifically it may be performed, the music fails to have that effect upon the congregation which it should have, because not participated in by the members individually. Money is made to take the place of mind, and others are paid for doing what they should be prepared to do themselves, and the benefit of which they cannot fully enjoy while it is performed by proxy. But on the other hand there are many congregations where this part of the worship is so badly performed, and is so *unscientific* that it fails to be the thing that is intended—*music*. Music in the church, like music every where else in the universe of God, where it exists, is the combination of sounds so as to please the ear ; the production of harmony and melody. Hence when singing is so conducted as to produce discordant and unharmonious sounds, it fails to be *music*, and is destitute of that adaptation to the cultivation of devotional feeling, which is ever found in true music. While then we repudiate that cold and formal singing which emanates from a professional and paid choir, we are equally grieved at the careless and blundering manner in which it is performed in many of our congregations. The whole congregation should feel under as much obligation to prepare to sing acceptably, as to read intelligently. The rules of music, as well as the rules of reading, should be studied *outside* of the religious meetings of the congregation, that during their exercises both *singing* and *reading* may be done "decently and in order." The whole congregation should be so familiar with the church-tunes as to allow them to throw

their whole souls into the *sentiment* they are singing, "making melody in their hearts to God," while at the same time they violate none of the laws of music.

The idea which has obtained to a considerable extent among our brethren that they could have their eyes on the notes, and their minds on the sentiment, while singing the songs of Zion, is, in our judgment, perfectly absurd. The most practicable method of preparing a congregation for devotional singing on the Lord's Day, and other occasions, is to keep up a weekly singing society, composed of the members of the church, male and female, young and old. They should practise together such tunes as are *suitable* for church music, and thereby prepare themselves for singing in the congregation. Some of our brethren seem not to know that there is such a thing as devotional *tunes*, and hence there is frequently a great want of adaptation in the selections which are made for the devotional exercises of the Lord's House.

The frequent change of tunes, has, among us as a people, proved to be very injurious to our church music. Those entirely new, or only partially learned, are introduced to the exclusion of those that are familiar, and the consequence is the great majority are unable to participate in the exercise. If a tune has sufficient excellence to be worthy of an introduction into the congregation, it should be sung in the "singing society" until it is familiar, and can be performed by all who wish to unite in the singing. *The church is not the place to learn to sing, but the place where we should sing what we have learned.*

But in church singing it is not only a matter of importance *how* we sing, we should also consider *what* are the sentiments to which we give utterance with the voice of song. That singing may have a salutary effect upon those who perform, and those who hear, we must sing sentiments that are in accordance with the divine teaching and that christian experience which obtains among the children of God. The most beautiful tune may be prostituted to the expression of words dishonoring to God, and deleterious to the minds of both singers and hearers. If we would "sing with the spirit and the understanding," it is as necessary that words conveying proper ideas should be used, as it is in teaching, or exhortation, or in prayer.

The "hymn-book" then, has much to do with church singing, and we regret to know that in many of our congregations a book has been adopted, and is still retained, which is as much at fault in the sentiment of its compositions, as in the devotion of its music; a book which has grown worse in every edition of it, inasmuch as it seems to have been the design of its author to make it more and more acceptable to those denominations, who, in doctrine, deviate the farthest from the teachings of the sacred oracles. The best book that we have seen used in our congregations, and the one by far the most generally in use, is the "Christian Hymn-Book," published by Brother Campbell. But good as it is, we consider it by no means perfect, or as nearly so as a hymn-book might be, and ought to be. We think it is decidedly deficient in the *pathetic*, a qual-

ity essential to the potency and efficiency which a hymn-book should exercise. On several subjects the "bill of fare" provided for the "Disciples" is deplorably meagre, and we are not sure that the sentiment is invariably correct. Still it is more uniformly so than any we have seen, and being, all things considered, the best in use, we think it should be universally adopted, at least until a better one is produced, or it is so amended as to supersede the necessity of another. It is essential that uniformity should obtain in the use of a hymn-book, in order that those using it may become familiar with its contents. Hence an objection arises not only to the frequent introduction of new books, but also to any material alteration of old ones; especially if their improvement is not very apparent.

To sum up our ideas on this subject, we conclude, 1st. That singing is a regulation of Heaven adapted to the nature of man. 2d. That under every dispensation it has been a prominent means of expressing gratitude and praise to God. 3d. That it should form a part of the exercises of every congregation. 4th. That it is the duty of christians, individually, to prepare themselves for the performance of it. 5th. That singing in the congregation should be purely a *devotional* exercise. 6th. That the sentiment sung should correspond with the sentiment taught in the Scriptures, and that which christians express in their prayers, their exhortations, and their preaching.

If in common with our other duties, we cultivate a taste for sacred music—if always through evil as well as good

report, we are found with a devotional feeling, and our actions through life correspond with that devotion, we shall not only have our full share of happiness here, but shall be permitted to enjoy perfect felicity hereafter. "Golden harps" will be ours, and we shall attune our voices to a new song, and shall join with the redeemed throng, that, vast multitude which no man can number, in ascriptions of praise to the Lamb who "hast redeemed us to God by his blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people and nation."

J. B.

Political Ethics of the New Testament.

It is the excellence of the Bible as a book of ethics, and a proof of its divine origin, that its principles and rules apply to all the actions, relations, and conditions of men, actual or possible. It is at once the most comprehensive and the most specific code of morality in the world; *comprehensive*, in that its principles and precepts, though few and briefly expressed, cover the motives of all human conduct; and *specific*, in that it addresses each individual as having a personal responsibility to God for all his thoughts, for all his words, for all his purposes, for all his actions.

The Mosaic code, which was designed as a complete system of civil and canon law for a particular people, abounded in specific rules touching every duty and relation of life. It had its marriage law and its law of divorce; its laws of property and laws of trade; laws of agriculture and laws relating to animals; laws concerning education and worship, and laws concerning vice and crime; laws personal, domestic, social, sanitary, religious, and political;—all framed with a minute reference to every supposable case of conduct.

The New Testament deals more in general principles than in specific precepts. It is not a civil and ecclesiastical code for a particular nation, but a moral code for all mankind. Yet its principles and precepts apply to all possible states of society, to every relation of life, and every form and subject of personal action. The Epistles of the New Testament abound in minute applications of the principles and precepts of Christianity to man as an individual, to man in the family, to man in society, to man in the church, to man in the state. Every condition of human life as it then existed is fully met;—not by the invention of new rules for each case, but by the application of the original principles and precepts of Christ.

In the same way phases of life and conditions of society not then existing, are now met by the simple application of these principles. For example, the relation of employers and the employed, in many forms in which it is now constituted, did not exist in the primitive times of Christianity; but who can doubt that that relation upon either side is covered by such precepts as these? "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things." "Not purloining, but showing all good fidelity." "Give to your servants that which is just and equal;" and, "as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise."

The New Testament gives no specific instructions to electors; for when it was written, there was no such thing as a civil republic or a democracy in the world; but every such form of government had been swallowed up in the universal Roman Empire. But the principles of Christianity are freely applied to the political duties and rela-

tions of men as they then existed; and who can doubt that those same principles cover the obligations of men to the State under every form of government; or that the precept, "*Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus,*" applies to voting as well as to prayer? We repeat that it is an excellence of the Bible as a book of ethics, and a proof of its divine origin, that it is adapted to mankind universally in all the actions, relations, and conditions of life.

It is also the duty and the wisdom of the preacher of the Gospel, to endeavor to apply the principles and precepts of Christianity to all the existing relations and interests of men. It is this personal, practical application of the Gospel to human affairs that makes the Bible a living book. The office of the preacher is first to win men to Christ; and then to instruct, to guide, to help them in applying the spirit and the precepts of Christ to their entire conduct in life. His great aim should be to persuade his hearers to a blameless life; to lead them to be good men; good as husbands, good as fathers, good as merchants, good as citizens.

Thus the Apostles preached to all classes, conditions, and specific sins; and Paul exhorted Timothy, in those epistles which are the chart of ministers in every age, to divide aright the word of truth—rightly and skilfully teaching it—with a wise adaptation to men and to circumstances; and, also, to give instruction to men according to their classes, conditions, and relations in life; to reprove, rebuke, and exhort, with a watchful zeal, in season and out of season. Every faithful and wise steward will endeavor to dispense the things of Christ according to the actual present necessities of those to whom he ministers.

And as it is the excellence of the Bible that it is adapted to all the specific duties, wants, and relations of life; and as it is the wisdom of the minis-

ters to seek out the applications of the Gospel to all the circumstances of his hearers; so it is the spirit of the true Christian, to desire whatever of light he can gain from the Bible and the pulpit as to his specific duties, as a private individual, as a man of family, as a man of business, as a citizen or an officer of the State. Desiring to do all things to the glory of Christ, he will be thankful for any principle or suggestion that may help him in the discharge of his duty in any relation of life. The preacher may mistake in his application of the principles of the Gospel to specific cases; just as he may mistake in the interpretation of any rule or doctrine of the Bible; the hearer is to judge him and his words, by the only infallible standard of truth; but the true Christian will desire to know *how* he can serve Christ in his business; how he can serve Him as a citizen; as well as to know how he can be pardoned through his death, and justified through his resurrection.

That Christian who carps at the application of the principles of Christianity to his business transactions, as "secular preaching;" who carps at the application of the principles of Christianity to his political action, as "political preaching;" who sneers at the application of Bible principles to the question of temperance, as "fanaticism;" and at the application of these principles to the crime of slavery, as "abolitionism;" who hears devoutly all that Christ has done for him, but frets and chafes at being reminded that, whether as a merchant or a politician, in the shop, the counting-house, on 'change, in the caucus, at the club, and at the polls, he is "to do all things, in word and deed, in the name of Christ, and to the glory of God;" that Christian who likes all preaching but the preaching that presses upon his specific duties; and faults and abuses the pulpit because, in the midst of an evil and gainsaying world, it tries to hold up

the standard of Christian action;—has yet to learn what are the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, and should be remembered with compassion, in the prayers of all the saints, that he may be delivered out of the snare of the devil.—*Exchange*.

Christian System, No. 11.

Among the most important of christian exercises is that of *prayer*. Indeed it seems to be indissolubly interwoven with everything else connected with the true worship of the living God.

Do we sing the songs of Zion? Do we exhort? Do we teach? Do we yield obedience to the commands of Heaven? Do we visit the sick? Do we feed the hungry, and clothe the naked? *prayer* is the atmosphere we must breathe, and is that which can best strengthen us in the performance of duty, whilst we tread the rough pathway of this wicked world.

Prayer as defined by Cruden is "an offering up of our desires to God for things lawful and needful, with an humble confidence to obtain them through the mediation of Christ. It is either mental or vocal, private or public; for ourselves or others; for the procuring of good things, or the removing, or preventing of things evil." From this definition, it will be seen that like every other religious action, prayer is consequent upon faith in the divine record. The apostle says "that without faith it is impossible to please Him: for he that cometh to God must *believe* that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him."

As God is the object of our prayers, and Christ the hope of our acceptance

with God, it follows that the more intimate our acquaintance with the bible, the stronger will be our convictions of the necessity of prayer, and the better will we be prepared acceptably to approach a throne of grace, in humble confidence that our prayers will be heard and answered.

As one of the fixed land-marks in reference to this institution, we observe that no person, can acceptably ask God for any blessing unless they employ the means through which the blessing is promised. To ask God for what he has not promised, or to ask Him for what he has promised, whilst we fail to comply with the means through which he has promised it, is to say the least, a presumptuous trifling with the great Jehovah. An apostle says "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like the wave of the sea, driven with the wind and tossed. For let not that man think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord."

Whenever the sinner looks into the perfect law of liberty, "and sees the exceeding sinfulness of sin" when he realizes that he is guilty before God, and that dying in impenitence and unpardoned, he must sink down to "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power;" he will necessarily *pray*. He will naturally call upon God for mercy. It is a mistaken idea that the sinner has no right to pray. The *impenitent* sinner has neither the *right* nor the *disposition* to do so, for the very fact

that a person has a disposition to supplicate a throne of grace, and to ask forgiveness in the name of Christ, is evidence that he is *penitent*, and that he has faith in Jesus Christ as a savior, and in the pardoning mercy of God. But in order that his prayer for pardon may be of faith, he must avail himself of the means through which God has promised to forgive the sinner for Jesus' sake. Prayer will accompany him in every step that he makes; for one of the invariable characteristics of true conversion, is to destroy all "confidence in the flesh," and to place reliance entirely on the arm of Omnipotence for strength and support. In his resolves to reform his life, and to forsake his sins, he prays to God for strength. In his determination to confess, before his fellow men, the name of that Savior who died for him, that he might have the pardon of his sins, he prays to God for courage. When in obedience to the command of the Savior he goes down into the watery grave, and "is *buried* with him by baptism into death, he prays to God for his blessing in the realization of sins pardoned, the gift of the Holy Spirit, and the hope of eternal life.

The christian stands in a different relation to God, from that of even the *penitent* sinner. He is an adopted child of God, and by the spirit of adoption can say "*Abba, Father.*" Being an heir of God, and a joint-heir with Jesus Christ, the christian can scripturally ask for blessings and protection, which the disobedient cannot in faith ask for, because they have no promises made to them, while they continue in their state of alienation toward the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. But even

the christian, in order that his prayer may be of faith, must remember that he is to ask only for what his Heavenly Father has promised, and in the use of the means through which he has graciously promised to bless his children. It is the privilege and duty of christian parents, to ask God's blessing upon their children, but they can only ask this favor in faith, while they are striving to "bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." It is right and proper for christians to pray for the prosperity of the church, for the edification of the brotherhood, and the conversion of the world, but they can only do so in faith, when they are laboring to that end by a godly walk and behaviour, and by making a personal sacrifice in behalf of that object, of whatever may be necessary to further on such a result. It is the duty of christians to pray for the relief of their distressed fellow men; for the sick, the afflicted, the widow, the fatherless, the downtrodden, the oppressed, and the nations in heathen idolatry; but to ask in faith, we must to the extent of our abilities be found visiting the widow, and the fatherless, and the sick in their afflictions, using our influence against oppression, and for the restoration of equal and unalienable rights, to the whole human family, and to labor for the dissemination of the Word of Life, among the benighted nations of the earth. It is a privilege of the christian to pray for deliverance from temptation, and strength to resist the evil influences by which he is surrounded; but to do so scripturally, he must examine himself, learn the points at which he is the most vulnerable, and studi-

ously avoid all contact with persons or places where he would be liable to temptation.

But while prayer without living in the use of means is ineffectual; we should remember that as far as procuring the blessings of Heaven is concerned, our actions, or the use of means, are equally futile without prayer. The prayerless professor can at best, have but "a form of godliness," and is entirely destitute of the joy and peace which the true christian enjoys. Prayer is the nearest approach that the christian can make in this world, toward God and heaven, and the altar of praise, and thanksgiving the most sacred of any on earth, for there he leaves the world behind, and unbosoming his soul he pours out his desires, where none but God is near. As the children of the Lord, we have need of stated secret prayer, of the daily family altar, of the social prayer-meeting, and of prayer as a part of the stated meetings on the Lord's day, and as it is enjoined upon christians that they should perform all things "decently and in order," it seems to us that some attention might properly be bestowed upon the subject of public prayers.

As to the *matter* of such prayers, it is not necessary that we should add any thing further. If our prayers are of faith; if we ask God for those things he has promised, while we are living in the use of the means by which they are to be obtained, we cannot well go astray as to matter. But what is the proper *attitude* of those engaged in public prayer, is a question which is yet unsettled in the minds of many of the brethren; at least we should judge so, from

the practical demonstrations seen in the most of our congregations. In the same assembly, perhaps, may be seen some kneeling, some standing, and others with their heads slightly bowed, while not a few remain in the same sitting posture they occupy, during the other exercises of the meeting. With regard to secret and family prayer there is, as far as we are advised, but one posture in practice, and that is falling upon the knees. All parties say that on such occasions it is the most fitting, and we have for it the precedent of the apostles, and primitive christians. It is undoubtedly the most reverential posture of the body, and when practicable is preferable to any other. But in mixed congregations, especially in rooms that are crowded, it is frequently attended with great inconvenience, and sometimes altogether impracticable, and as uniformity is desirable, it would seem that a position less inconvenient, and as nearly as possible approaching it in reverential aspect should be adopted. We give it as our opinion that for the whole congregation to arise and fix their heads in such a position as will best secure seclusion from contiguous objects, would be the best position that could be adopted, in all stated or numerous attended meetings of the brethren. We most heartily deprecate the careless and undevotional practice so common even among church members, of remaining in their seats and apparently unconcerned, during the public prayers being made in the congregation.

It is no doubt proper on most occasions that the person intending to address the congregation, should address the throne of grace, and lead the brethren

in prayer immediately preceding his discourse. It usually has a salutary effect upon his own mind, and prepares him for the further discharge of his duties. We think however that it would be time very profitably spent, for the brethren to meet an hour or even half an hour earlier than the time for preaching to commence, and engage in social prayer, and other devotional exercises. Some of our brethren suppose that the *sisters*, should be excluded from any participation in public prayers, but we are convinced that such an idea is not found in the New Testament. On the contrary it teaches the perfect equality of christians as far as the privilege of prayer is concerned, and the same course of argument that would exclude the sisters from engaging in public prayers would also deprive them of the privilege of singing in the congregation. With all those who are willing to abide by apostolic teaching, Paul has for ever settled this question, inasmuch as he has given direction with regard to the covering of their heads, while engaged in prayer, which he certainly would not have done, had it been inadmissible for them to pray in public, or even inexpedient for them to do so.

In conclusion we would remind our readers, that if we pray understandingly, if we ask God for what he has promised, and in the use of his appointed means, there is no danger of praying too much, or too earnestly, or that it will be performed by the wrong persons. Prayer is essential to growth in christianity, whether as individuals, or as congregations, for it is only to those who *ask*, that God has promised to give his Holy spirit, and that grace and

wisdom, by which we may reach the climes of blessedness on high. Let us then "pray without ceasing" and *act* accordingly, for the upbuilding of the Redeemer's Kingdom, and for assuaging the woes of a sin-cursed world.

J. B.

The Source of Christian Strength.

The fact, that our best condition, tried by the standard of Heavenly excellence, is one of weakness, inefficiency, and shameful failure, is we believe undeniable. The conviction of this state of things forces itself upon us from almost every quarter of our land. The cry almost universal is, "We are weak, feeble, languishing, almost dead;" "send us help." Leaving out of view a few sections to speak particularly of our own State, the spectacle presented is one of entire dearth of every thing like faithful, diligent religious worship or energetic, worthy service in the cause of our Master. I speak not of these things in comparison with the various religious parties of the land. Compared with them there might or might not be reason for boasting. Be that as it may, when brought to the great standard of Christian service—the Word of Truth—our best efforts appear feeble and imperfect indeed.—There has been much speculation as to cause of these things. Much has been written in regard to the "signs of the times," and many reasons have been presented why these things are so, and how they may be remedied. We doubt, however, very much whether the cause or the remedy has been generally or fairly set forth. Some attribute this state of things to the isolated, independent condition of our churches—having no proper directory to keep them all in rank and duty. Others, again, to a want of spirituality in the teachings of our preachers. Our preachers, they say, do not preach enough about the Holy Spirit and its influence, and the

consequence is that those converted under such teachings are a shallow, unspiritual, irreverent people. Whether these are the causes or not it is not our purpose now to examine, though, as we have already said, we doubt very much whether these or any other of the commonly assigned causes are the true one. There is a cause which reaches deeper into the matter than any of these things. It is a want of faithful adherence to the law of the Lord in form, letter and spirit. It consists in forsaking—giving up in fact the high and responsible ground taken in the beginning of this struggle for gospel liberty—that the word of God itself alone was a full and complete guide and instructor in all things pertaining to life and redemption, and that the teachings and examples of the New Testament in exact purport and form were the only sources of Christian knowledge and obedience. I repeat, our mistake has been in giving up this high ground. We may not have renounced in form, but it cannot be denied that there has been a fearful departure from it in both the style of our worship and the matter and manner of our teaching. Men and women made Christians under the teaching that the word of God, without guess, speculation, or comment, contained all that was to make them wise unto salvation, and that was to make them strong men and women to do battle for the Truth, regarded it as of the first importance to know and understand that word. The consequence was, that they were ready at all times, with their Testaments with them, and moreover well and deeply treasured in their hearts, to meet either priest or layman with weapons of warfare, not carnal but spiritual. They may have been wanting in the graces of school-taught logic, but they possessed—what far outweighed this deficiency—hearts made fearless by the love of the Truth, and the sword of the Spirit, with which they dared to make fearful havoc with

the corrupt imposition of men. There may be many things which we could wish had been otherwise, but they were what we fear we are not, lovers of the truth for its own sake, and unwilling to compromise it for any favor or advantage in the universe. In this state of things the cause prospered, and men every where, whose hearts were not wholly enslaved in sectarian ignorance and prejudice, acknowledged and respected the authority of the Truth—While denounced and persecuted by united Christendom, as the most dangerous heretics, we continually made conquest and were utterly invincible to every attack. But this persecution has in a great degree lost its bitterness—occasionally only some of the venom of past malignity is spit at us. We have been admitted to a rank and station in many places among the popular sects of the day. And what neither persecution, contumely, nor derision could do, is about to be done by popularity. In justice to our newly acquired rank, as one of the countenanced and respected religious bodies of the day, of course it becomes us gratefully to conform to the customs of our peers, and ape their extravagancies. Thus we have worked on until the simplicity of Christian worship is in many places well nigh swallowed up in the gulf of fashionable religion. These things we know are not universal. There are still churches and individuals who cling to the simple unvarnished word, and are content to worship God just as he has appointed. The strong tendency I fear, however, is for the popular way.

We write these things in all kindness, blaming no man, and censuring no man or set of men. They are things which all God-fearing Christians see and deplore. The burden of shame is upon us all. And the earnest question is, What is the remedy for these things? Is there one? Or shall we go on and become daily less godly, less devoted, less spiritual, and more conformed to

the vanities of men? We think, yea we *know* there is a remedy, if Heaven's message be true. The gospel of joy, and peace, and love to wretched mortals was not intended to make a heartless, insincere, and frivolous people, but as we have said repeatedly, it was to make a better people than any body now known on this earth. A change, a deep and radical change, must be made or all our professions must result in sheer failure. The great question is, How shall the work be done? Many remedies have been proposed but we doubt the efficacy of most of them. We doubt whether the greater part of the religious teaching has any tendency to help the matter. Beautifully fitted up systems, no matter how true, cannot do it. Abstract discussions of the nature of Faith, Repentance, Baptism, Spiritual Influence, Religion, or any other matter connected with man's redemption cannot do it. We might as well expect our physical bodies to become strong and active upon husks and chaff, as to expect to derive spiritual life from dry abstractions. The gospel itself is no abstraction, and there is not an abstract, regularly wrought-out, systematic idea connected with it. It is personal in its origin as the purpose of the God of the universe to bless man; personal in its manifestation in the person of Jesus Christ the Son of God, and personal in its application as addressed in words of love and mercy to the heart of every individual man or woman who hears its affectionate voice of warning and entreaty.

There is no hope then from abstract speculation about any religious duty, but it is all a waste of labor and a vain philosophy which men endeavor to substitute for the gospel, deceiving both themselves and others.

The only hope is in a return to the primitive order, to the ancient platform in word and form, in letter and spirit, to receive the teachings of the New Testament as the only authority in re-

ligious belief and practice. Till we do this we cannot expect any better results than such as already surround us, and even worse than these. The longer we neglect it the more difficult the task, and harder will it be for us to nerve our hearts to the effort. We cannot gain strength by neglect and procrastination, but we only lose what little vitality we yet possess.

The work, my brethren, will cost labor, toil, self-denial, but we have every motive to urge us on in it. It must reach the very foundations of our lives. In every dealing with our fellow-men we must exhibit the power of the religion which binds us to God. In our families and with our daily associates there must be clear and distinct manifestation of the love of the truth and our devotion to it. Not only in family worship must we give proof of our reverence for God, but in every word and action of our lives. The formality of family worship while our lives are wicked, our tempers unruly, stubborn and devilish, and our tongues continually laden with evil speaking and bitterness toward our neighbor, is a mockery in Heaven's sight.

But not alone privately but publicly our duties and responsibilities are great, and we fear but poorly discharged. The idea of Christians being in a community without ever letting their light shine before the world, is most ruinous. Wherever there are even two or three, it is their duty to come together at least upon every first day of the week to recognize each other as brethren, to encourage, admonish, and exhort each other, and to feed upon the heavenly food of the new Institution. It is useless to call for help from abroad until they do this. What use can there be in an evangelist turning people to God when there is no church in whose fostering bosom they may come for nurture and growth—no school of Christ in which they can perfect themselves in holiness and love. In old and long

established churches we fear that the duty of the bishops, to train, instruct, and guard from evil those who are but babes in Christ, is far from being faithfully executed. Most persons, we believe, in submitting to Christ have dispositions of heart to do his service faithfully, and to become intelligent, pious, and godly followers of our Lord, but what a shame it is to us that so few become able even to read intelligibly a chapter of the Word of Life, or offer an acceptable petition to our God.—There is a sad error with us some where.

If we expect to prosper with the work of Heaven these are the matters which claim our attention. We must begin in our own lives, with our neighbors, in our families, in our churches. Till these are active, earnest, and zealous, till every member of the Church of God is made to feel personal responsibilities in the religion of our Lord, all our boast will be in vain. We may give money to colleges, missionary societies, ministerial educational societies, and have preachers manufactured of all grades to suit the demand, and still the cause of truth will languish and we ourselves become dead and spiritless in our Christian life.

There is but one means appointed by Heaven for the work. It is the Word which is both spirit and life. The might of the gospel alone can arouse us from torpor and weakness. It can make us strong, active, vigilant soldiers of the cross, ready at all times, with willing hearts and faithful hands, to endure toil, labor, and privation for the blessed cause of our Master. Till we bring ourselves to the point to take it as our guide, our counselor and our Hope, our efforts will all be fruitless abortions, and our speculations and contrivances consummate vanity.—

Gospel Advocate.

He that saith unto the wicked, thou art righteous; him shall the people curse, nations shall abhor him.

Language.

BY GEORGE B. BAUM.

Language is an artificial method of communicating ideas by articulate sounds, which are issued through the glottis, and formed, or modulated, by the mouth and its appendages.

It has been a question of frequent discussion, whether language is of divine origin or an invention of mankind, devised by the necessity of having some method to express their wants and intentions to one another. According to Scripture, it is of divine origin, or inspiration; and the different languages are attributed to "the confusion of tongues," which God willed during the building of the Tower of Babel.

On the other hand, men may have *instinctively* sought one another as belonging to the same species, for mutual *protection* and *defence*, and as the mental powers, except sensation, are based upon *association*, speech may have originated from the natural articulate sounds, as a *first* means of communication. It is an absolute and evident necessity, that all assemblies must have some object or purpose to fulfill; and without any means of expression by language, they would naturally resort to signs and gestures, as the only method of conveying their intentions. In this manner, we may trace the progress of language to its present degree of high and exalted perfection; and although speech may be of divine origin, language is the result of reason and cultivation, and a complete treatise upon its origin and progress would be a history of the human mind.

Should we imagine a period prior to the invention of words, or any means of communication, and reflect upon the condition of mankind at such an era, it would seem impossible that families should assemble together, and form societies, without either the want or means of expression. We would suppose that language must have been

used previous to the formation of society, for the purpose of expressing their wants and impressions, and as a bond to unite their common welfare and interests. Yet, we can readily trace its progress and development from a few signs and ejaculations to its present excellence.

In either case, as regards the origin of this art, words, in the beginning, must have been exceedingly limited; and we may consider the causes which served to develop it, without in the slightest degree infringing upon the principles of devout philosophy, or the minds of the most fastidious believers.

If we suppose a period before the invention of language, men would have no means of expression except signs and gestures, accompanied by rude ejaculations and exclamations. This is the most easy and natural mode of communication, and is still practised by persons who desire to express themselves in an unknown language. Gestures and exclamations constituted the beginning of speech, as the first method of expression.

As society progressed, persons felt the necessity of a more extensive method of conveying their impressions, and language became developed. Certain sounds or *names* were substituted for signs, to represent objects and occurrences; and this was the first step in the progress of speech. It is obvious that there must have been some similarity between the "impression and the expression," in order that they might understand each other; and an *imitation* is the most natural method of expression, it is evidently the beginning of all languages. This analogy between the words and objects, or ideas, may be traced in many modern expressions.

These sounds or different inflections of the voice, were at first naturally harsh and disagreeable; but as words increased, and speech became more refined and cultivated, they grew smooth

and musical, and constitute the *prosody* of language. They originated in nature, and have been cultivated by art. That is, the first rudiments of speech, or the articulate sounds, are natural; but their application as a means of communication, is an invention of mankind. All the arts have originated and been developed from accident, design or imitation; and their degree of perfection is the result of reason and cultivation. In tracing their progress, we invariably find these causes to control their development.

Prosody, or intonation, is both so natural and easy, that some nations prefer using the same word to express several ideas, rather than employ new words. The Chinese by modulating their voice in pronouncing *one* word, make it signify various objects and impressions. In this manner they are capable of expressing all their intentions, of communicating their wants, and of conveying their knowledge and instruction. This same style has been practised in all ages, and by all nations, before there was a sufficiency of words to justify the name of language.

The Greeks and Romans cultivated their taste for the smooth and musical pronunciation of words to the highest degree. They accented each letter, so that the voice rose and fell with every syllable, like the notes in music; by which it was frequently accompanied. In this respect they attained the highest perfection that is known; but the rules which governed their measure have long since been neglected and forgotten.

The *style* of language in its primitive state was profusely figurative. It seems that men never used so many figures of speech as when they lacked words to express themselves; metaphors, hyperboles, similes, and a variety of forms of speech, were substituted for a scarcity of words to convey their meaning; and it is owing to the necessity of employing this style that

poetry is *prior* to prose. The history of all the earliest ages, and the traditional love of distinguished persons and events, have been transmitted by these figurative expressions.

The Old Testament contains many examples of this style; and the earliest works of all nations abound in beautiful and figurative expressions. They employed this style from necessity; but we use it for ornament and embellishment.

As language became more copious and simple, words increased, and were used as symbolic or arbitrary, instead of imitative, or the signs of ideas. They were addressed to the understanding, instead of the fancy or the imagination; and this figurative style, together with gesticulation and ejaculation, were gradually dropped and abolished.

Gestures were long afterward revived, and used for ornament. They were cultivated and practised as an art by the Greeks and Romans; and carried to the greatest degree of excess. Action was considered the highest attainment of an actor or orator; and it was contested whether language or gesticulation was capable of the greatest variety of expression. Cicero and Roscius publicly contested this point. Pantomime was introduced for the entertainment of the public, and gesture entirely superseded declamation. It finally engrossed the attention of the public, and even the minds of the senators, to such an extent that it was prohibited by law.

The greatest epoch in the progress and development of language was caused by the invasion of the Roman Empire. Rome, at this period, was the grand emporium of the world; the very embodiment of civilization and the source and centre from which emanated the dictates of power and knowledge. Its downfall created a complete change in the style, adaptation, and pronunciation of language throughout

all Europe. The Latin tongue was altered into barbaric idioms, and the smooth and polished measure of its musical accents was neglected and forgotten. Poetry, for a time, was neither needed nor appreciated; and Poets were replaced by Philosophers. A plain, precise system of speaking was substituted for the easy, flowing, and musical pronunciation; and the principles of reason and philosophy entirely eradicated the fiery and pompous triumphs of theatrical declamation. The entire attention of the public was directed towards obtaining a simple mode of expression; and words were addressed to the reason, and the understanding; instead of appealing to the fancy, or the imagination. Poetry was neglected, and only used for ornament; while prose was substituted as better adapted for that clearness and precision of style, which they desired to attain. This change from poetry to prose tended in the greatest degree to develop language to its present perfection; and the latter is still used, as better suited for reason and argument.

Language has now attained the highest degree of preciseness, and strength of expression. It has exceeded its purpose, and we not only describe emotions, express sensations, convey knowledge, communicate wants, and reason upon the obtuse, abstract, and invisible conceptions of the mind and the imagination, but we find some thoughts so beautifully expressed and profusely adorned, that we can barely distinguish the mere ideas amid the flowery wreaths which are woven around them. It is not only the most useful of all the arts, but it is the greatest invention, blessing, and benefit, that man ever devised or enjoyed; and after fulfilling all purposes, it serves for ornament and amusement.

The greatest distinction between the ancient and modern languages—especially the Greek and Latin—consists in the mode of expression. They

placed the object *first*, and adjusted their words according to their ideas. We arrange words so as to agree with our understanding; and usually form a sentence to give the cause, effect and conclusion. This arrangement is more refined and precise, but less animating and impressive than the ancient. One is addressed to the imagination, and is better adapted to poetry and oratory, while the other is directed to the understanding, and is more favorable for prose, perspicuity, and philosophy. Several modern languages retain the old style of arrangement, and are distinguished for their musical pronunciation.

There is a great analogy between the language and the national character of a people. It is soft, slow, musical, or lively, in proportion to the sensibility of the race; and animating, impressive, or volatile, according to their general characteristics. We may trace this similarity in all dialects, and it is curious to observe the influence which custom, habit, and position, have upon the various languages. The Latin is grave and commanding; and has a considerable degree of power and dignity. Its marked accents, strict measure, and studied arrangement convey a good idea of the serious and calm dignity of the Roman Fathers. Its writers have survived, and their writings have outlived their tongue; but many languages are now spoken, which will die out and be forgotten long before the world ceases to cherish their immortal names. The English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish are almost the only languages now spoken by civilized nations, and they are all indebted to the Latin for many derivations, formations, and phrases.

The English, though chiefly Saxon, is enriched from the Latin, Greek and French. It sacrifices beauty for utility, and excels all languages in copiousness, preciseness, and strength of expression. It is better adapted for prose

and argument than for fancy or poetry; and the world is indebted to it for its greatest writers and most valuable works.

The French is principally composed of Gallic and Latin words. It has a greater variety and more expressive accents than any other language, which renders it exceedingly brisk and lively. It is too light for sentiment, and too volatile for high and lofty expressions. Lamartine remarked that he was a poet without a language. It is generally repudiated by the best writers; yet many of their works will survive the lapse of centuries.

The Italian and Spanish are mostly alterations from the Latin, and are noted for their musical pronunciation. This is partly owing to their style of arranging words according to their ideas, which renders their languages very animating and impressive, and adapts them to poetical and figurative expressions. Italy has long been recognized as the land of poetry and song.

The Mexican language is very irregular, but copious. Owing to a deficiency of consonants, they *compound* their words, making some of them sixteen syllables or more in length.

The Chinese employ less words than any other race. By modulating the voice in pronouncing the *same* word, they make it express several ideas. In their language, when a word is placed *first*, it is an adjective; if *last*, a substantive. It is the chief delight of this nation to be ridiculous in all things; and if the "Son of the Sun" would throw a little more light upon his devoted but benighted subjects, in the way of developing their faculties, bettering their condition, and advancing their interests, they would soon find words both to extol him and express themselves.

The Hebrew is the representative of all the Eastern languages. It is generally considered as the *first* language,

although the Syriac, Greek, Teutonic, Chinese, and other dialects, have many advocates to claim this honor for them. Owing to the imperfect and chimerical traditions of the earliest ages, this interesting fact will ever remain unknown—a mere matter of conjecture.

It is impossible to say how many different languages are now spoken, as there are many which have not been numbered. In the course of time, *one* may supersede all others, and become UNIVERSAL; such a result is for the lapse of centuries to determine. As it is, speech is bestowed upon man alone; and of all the inventions, advantages, discoveries, and acquisitions that mankind ever devised or enjoyed, language has produced the greatest results and enjoyments.

Bible Vindicated.—No. 6.

BRO. BOGGS.—We have now opened the New Testament, and shall ask the reader to read again No. 5 of this series. For, that system of Slavery with which the apostles and first christians had to do, differed widely in many essential aspects from that which so grievously afflicts the American people, both Church and State.

That was not negro Slavery, ours is. The right then to hold slaves was not based upon national inferiority or color, as is ours, but the right of conquest, claiming the persons of the conquered upon the same ground they did their lands and chattels. This was understood when the belligerent nations met each other upon the field of battle. The alternatives between which hostile nations had to choose, were to surrender their national independence or to maintain it by an appeal to the sword, with the liability of becoming slaves.

Hence, the captives offered in the slave market were often whiter than the bidders, and more learned than their masters. Clerks, amanuenses, philosophers, and orators, commanded the highest price. "*And the price, from*

ten to seventy pieces of gold, was determined by their age, their strength, and their education." Gib. Rome: vol. 4, page 279.

There was something at the least apparently even-handed and magnanimous in their way of obtaining slaves. They could make at least as fair a show of right to their slaves as we can to the conquered Territory of Mexico.—But what show of right can America make to her four millions of slaves? This question leads out something the most *contemptible and mean that ever blackened* the history of any nation since the world began. German, Spanish, English, and American avarice is the origin of American Slavery, and not manly conquest. Cupidity, the most sordid—a cold-hearted selfishness, with which only the most malignant of fallen spirits could inspire the most corrupt heart of fallen humanity, is the origin of our system of Slavery. Away yonder in Africa is a colored race—a weak and ignorant people.—This despised, defenceless people might easily be captured or decoyed and shipped to other ports and sold for slaves. In this conception we have the origin of American Slavery. When this lust was conceived it brought forth sin—slaves—crews of pirates (manstealers) bound for the shores of Africa—with manacles for the hands, and chains for the feet—*all aboard*, sailed for English ports well freighted with the spoils of theft and robbery. Now markets are opened—auctioneers are obtained—bidders are invited—sales go off briskly—the new kind of chattel becomes the subject of English legislation—Slavery spreads rapidly through the kingdom—is extended to all her islands adapted to slave labor—sent with the colonists to America—and, finally, Slavery becomes a subject of American legislation; and every State in this great confederacy can have slaves if it will so decide—and traffic in the bodies and souls of men to its heart's desire.

A pebble may turn the current of a river; a thought may revolutionize an empire; and the conception to acquire wealth by stealing men and women has agitated kingdoms—will yet shake America like a reed, and has, and yet is making millions *mourn*.

Now, reader, when you shall read what may follow—when you shall hear Paul and Peter talking about Slavery, you will please remember that it is not this *but that*. That which could claim a more honorable paternity; that system of Slavery which grew out of the law of nations, viz: might gives right, and when might changed sides, the parties changed sides, and the present masters by the same law were the slaves. This, hard as it was, was yet more honorable than that which originated in skulking, kidnapping, and piracy. It was not possible for heathenism to originate a system that would equal ours in enormity. There is an intricacy, and complexity connected with this to which Roman Slavery was a stranger. The legal restraints and embarrassments imposed upon manumission have bound both the master and the slave. And as the "sweetest wine makes the sourest vinegar," so Slavery, by the so called christian nations, will, upon the same principle be the most crafty, subtle, base, and most difficult to uproot.

"Art thou called being a servant care not for it: for if thou mayest be made free use it rather." 1st Cor: 7, 21. There *was* then such a thing as slaves being "made free" in Paul's time. The will of the master was all that was wanting and the slave *was* "free." But an American slave *cannot* be made "free." If the master manumits, he must at the same time give bail for the good behavior of the freed man, or within a given number of days the slave must leave the State, or be sold to the highest bidder in behalf of the State. No matter what his attachments are to the land of his

nativity; no matter if his father, mother, brother, sisters, wife, and children are there, he must leave or enter Slavery again. Such freedom!! If Paul were here he would not insult American slaves by saying what he said to slaves in Greece, "If you would be made free," etc.

"Art thou called being a servant care not for it." I marvel at the ease with which apologists can pass over this passage of Scripture. They say, Be not perplexed about it; that is only the same idea with another dress. Art thou called, converted, being a husband, a wife, a father, a mother, a son, or a daughter, be not perplexed about it. To stand in any of these relations is rather afflictive, but being in this *fix* now, make the best of it; "care not for it." Either of these would imply that there was something hard or afflictive in the relation. A kind mother just now said to her dear little one who unfortunately got one of its fingers badly pinched when shutting the door, "don't cry, 'care not for it, care not for it,' do not be perplexed about it," are the same forms of speech and sayings used for the same purpose, viz: to comfort in hard allotments, and to express sympathy for the sufferer. "Care not for it;" to lay it to heart will not mend the matter so long as you stand in this relation; but see here, may not your state be changed. "If thou mayest be made free use it rather." To desire freedom is right, and obtain freedom if you can. "If thou mayest be made free," etc. The apostle is not in this place teaching duty, but what is here said bears directly upon relation. No good man will encourage the dissolving of right and justifiable relations; while every good man would say to such as were coerced into a wrong relation—a relation which had a tendency to opposition and injustice—get out of it if you can, do not continue in it if you "may be made free." No language

could more unequivocally express the wrongfulness of a relation than to say to the suffering party in that relation "if thou mayest be made free use it rather;" but, as the chances to be made free were quite uncertain, the apostle said to the suffering christian slave, if, in your civil relations you are a slave, in your moral relations, in your relations to Jesus Christ, you are "free." "He that is called being a servant is the Lord's free man." Ver. 22. The Lord's free man; this was some consolation; man's slaves, this was hard—"Ye (christians) are bought with a price, be not ye the servants (slaves) of man." This language is imperative; if it is not, "be of good cheer;" John 16, 35, is not, "be strong in the Lord;" Eph. 6, 10, is not, "be baptized;" Acts 10, 48, is not. Pro-Slavery pleaders slide over this prohibitory command with admirable facility. They say the apostle *only* gave a preference to freedom. Well, this was something against Slavery—themselves being judges. But *they* give their preference for Slavery and yet claim Paul as one of their religious advisers under Jesus Christ—claim to have been converted to God by that Gospel Paul preached; they and their leader differ in their preferences. He preferred freedom; they slavery. It is presumable, however, only when it is theirs to be masters and somebody else to be the slave. If they had to be the slaves they might readily be converted to the apostle's *preference*, but we deny that the text "be not yet the slaves of men" simply expresses a preference. What? an inspired apostle having and expressing only a preference in reference to an institution of the gravest importance; so regarded in all ages, and by all men, whether "bond" or "free?" an institution positively right or positively wrong, a positive good or a positive evil? What an insult to Paul; what slander upon the spirit of wisdom and right-

eousness by which he wrote. They want to make Paul a kind of *go-between* as many of them are, to hide their own cowardly neutrality under apostolic authority. No, Paul was not the man to set upon two stools; he said to the church members, "*be not ye the slaves of men*," and by fair implication be not ye the masters of "men" for the one implies the other. When he said to the members of the church "Be strong in the Lord," and the power of his "might;" "put on the armor of God," etc., he expressed more than a mere preference for strong christians. But to expose this *Pro-Slavery* sophism to the weakest reader, we will have another parallel from Paul.

"Be not ye therefore partakers with them." Eph. 5, 7. Above are enumerated, "fornication, uncleanness, covetousness, filthiness, foolish talking, jesting," etc. Let no man deceive you with vain words, because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience." Verse 6th. Then comes the prohibitory command, "Be not ye therefore partakers with them." For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord, walk as the children of the light. Ver. 8th. *I prefer* that ye should no longer be partakers with them. But *I don't care much either way*. "Let no man deceive you with vain words." If then, "Be not ye therefore partakers with them" is a command, "Be ye not the slaves of men" is also a command. Both are in the imperative mood and in the passive voice, and command that certain things should not be done. "Be not fornicators," etc., "Be ye not the slaves of men." But it will be asked, did not the Apostle command that every man should "abide in the same calling in which he was when converted?" Yes, brethren, "let every man wherein he was called therein abide with God." With this exception, however, Paul would say if the con-

verted slaves *can* be made free, let him no longer abide in slavery; "If thou mayest be made free use it rather," surely the Apostle did not command the slave in the 21st verse to abandon his calling if he had an opportunity, and in the 24th verse command him to abide in it. This, then, is an exceptional case. But as to all the other callings or relations enquired after, (see verse 1st to 29th, inclusive) let these remain as they were when called. The sum of the apostle's answer to the churches' inquiry in regard to slavery was this, let the relation be dissolved when it can be, "if thou mayest be made free," etc. Let not the relation be extended. Let not the free by any act or will of their own become slaves, "ye are bought with a price; be ye not the slaves of men; ye were called in freedom, abide in freedom; ye were not masters when called, then abide as ~~you~~ are, do not become masters, with the aforesaid exception, brethren, let every man wherein he was called therein abide with God; Let the relation of master and slave be dissolved so far as the present masters will consent; and to the rest of you, brethren, I say abide as you are." We appeal to the laws of language, to logic, and to every correct principle of interpretation for the correctness of this view of the passage. We challenge criticism. If slave-holders could find commands as unequivocal for the continuance of slavery in the church, as these bearing directly upon the abolition of it in the Church, they might with much assurance appeal to Paul and Peter for authority.

As the passage examined, is the only one in the New Testament bearing upon the abstract question of relation, and as it has been twisted and perverted to subserve *pro-slavery* ends, we have been at some pains to wrest it from such prostitution.

If the apostles so regulated the duties of master and slave that when the specified duties were discharged,

the relation would be fostered and continued in the Church, then might our opponents claim apostolic favor in behalf of the relation; but the most artful apologists have to concede too much to set up such a claim.

There is now before me the most ingeniously written apology for American Slavery that has yet come under my observation. We shall give a few extracts. A. C. Review, edited and published by Benjamin Franklin, vol. 1st, no. 2, page 39: "Men whose hearts become largely imbued with the spirit of the Gospel, gradually relax the bonds; the converted servant becomes better, and the feeling of kindness between master and slave is increased, and in thousands of instances results in his emancipation. In this way, the peaceable, orderly and legitimate workings of the religion of Jesus Christ have legally emancipated more slaves, in these United States," etc. That such was the effect of christianity upon Roman Slavery is a well authenticated fact—that such would be its influence upon American Slavery we doubt not—that such is its influence we deny. Where is the evidence that through the influence of christianity, "thousands of slaves are being emancipated in 'these United States.'" We will not charge the writer with exaggeration, but we do think there is too much of the *hyperbole* about this for sober fact. But in the next sentence he makes large abatements, and says: "Hundreds of good men, (and of these good men he names but two) one is no more, the other is yet living, these yielding to that preference the bible gives freedom over slavery in the emancipation of all the slaves that fell into their hands. Such men show their faith by legal, good, and peaceable works of righteousness." Whether a philosopher would smile or frown at this, would, I imagine, depend upon the amount of reverence he had for the bible. Two good men, A. Campbell

and B. W. Stone, have shown their "faith by legal, good, and peaceable works, of righteousness in the emancipation of their slaves." Their faith in what? Their "faith in the preference the bible gives freedom over slavery." The legitimate inference from these facts is that a good man's preferences will agree with Bible preferences, and such will show their faith by corresponding works. Why not insist upon this, Bro. Franklin, that all the "good" slaveholders in the church must do as these have done. That, as the "Bible gives a preference to freedom over slavery, so all "good men" must give the same preference, and make their preference manifest by "emancipating" all their slaves. Bro. Franklin says of the Bible upon this subject: "Here we plant our foot." *This is well.*—When you next write upon this subject, cite your readers in the South to those passages in the Bible where God has "preference for freedom over slavery," and then call their attention to those good men, and say to those slaveholders who will not emancipate their slaves—who have not as yet followed the example of these "good men, remember those who have spoken to you the word of God! whose faith follows considering the end of their behavior. Brother Franklin, you should do this or you should take your "foot" from the Bible and your *hand* likewise. Moreover, this would do more good than your fine declamation about abolitionists making the *Church* a political *engine*. But we must say a little more about this "Bible preference for freedom over slavery; "Prefers to regard more than something else a choice"—as, i. e. this is good but that is better. There are such things in the Bible "As the eating of meats and the observance of days. So then he that giveth her in marriage doth well, but he that giveth her not in marriage doth better." If the Bible—the exponent of the will of God to man has

placed slavery in this category, these apologists, these pliant writers are right enough. Then we will say slavery is good, but freedom is better. If such were my understanding—if I could so classify slavery, I would never have troubled myself about it. We do, then, regard the word "preference" as a mere salvo—an evasion—an artful sophism, most dishonorable to God, who looks upon the quality of things, who once said to slave-holders, "Let the oppressed go free," "break every yoke," and now says to the Church, "ye are bought with a price, be ye not the slaves of men." And finally on the question of relation—the relation is to the institution what the foundation is to the building—if that be substantial the structure may be permanent—if the basis is defective the building cannot stand, *but* by the aid of *braces*, *props*, &c. If the relation of master and slave is right, the abuse of the relation can form no valid objection to the relation. For that which is of *itself wrong* and *faulty*, cannot be *abused*. To say the thing is abused, is to pronounce the highest encomium upon its intrinsic excellence. When husbands and wives, parents and children "become largely imbued with the spirit of the Gospel," the parties in these relations are made better, the "feelings of kindness," between husband and wife are "increased," and the relation becomes the more indissoluble. Is not this true with reference to all parties in right relations? It is true.

How strange that, after brother F. had put forth his strong hand to support the tottering fabric, after he had driven away the mischievous abolitionists from the temple of slavery, he should have uttered the sentence quoted above. "Men whose hearts become largely imbued with the spirit of the Gospel, gradually relax the bonds, the converted servant becomes better, and the feeling of kindness between the

master and slave is increased, and in thousands of instances results in emancipation."

Whether intended or unintended by the writer, this is an assault upon the rightfulness of the slave relation, for which the editor of the Review can make no amends to slaveholders.

When the "spirit of the Gospel has largely imbued the heart of the master and the heart of the slave," the tendency is to separate, to dissolve the relation; but the absence of the "spirit of the Gospel" tends to unite and sustain the relation of master and slave. In all lawful, domestic, social, and religious relations the spirit of the Gospel *draws*: but in this it *drives*. So soon, then, as "the spirit of the Gospel shall have largely imbued the hearts" of all slaveholders, slavery will be brought to a perpetual end. I believe it with all my heart, dear brother.

If the "spirit of the Gospel," which is but another word for the "spirit" of Christ, will promote the "emancipation" of slaves, slavery must be an evil, for the good spirit of Christ will not destroy good. But when the "spirit" of holiness is brought to bear upon evil, the evil will be "overcome" by the "good." This is a *truism of universal application*.

But as long as the leaders of the people say *Slavery is good*, "both Bible and Testament, Moses and Paul, admit and sustain the relation of bond-master and bond-servant for 'life';" and as this is believed by masters and slaves, it will be difficult—most difficult—to "imbue their hearts with the spirit of the Gospel, for, but few, if any, will understand the mystery, how the Gospel can both 'admit and sustain the relation of master and slave for life,' and at the same time influence the master, 'largely imbued with the spirit of the Gospel' to emancipate all his slaves that may fall into his hands, as brother B. says two 'good men' have done.

But see, here is something hard for the unlearned to understand, how a "good man" can refuse to "sustain that which both Moses and Paul do admit and sustain." Be that as it may, we rejoice in this, that the aforesaid living "good man" did what he knew both Moses and Paul would justify, and "emancipate all the slaves that fell into his hands." In this he has his position, notwithstanding, "shewn his faith by legal, good, and peaceable works of righteousness."

We feel strongly impressed with the conviction that all good men will do likewise.

J. HARTZEL.

Teaching Common Things

In the report of the Superintendent of Common Schools of the State of Connecticut, we find the following extract from the Report of the School Committee of New London:

"In regard to the general course of instruction as pursued here and in the schools of the country generally, the committee believe that the attention bestowed, so almost exclusively, on arithmetic and other branches of mathematics, tends to the development of a power of the mind inferior to the reasoning powers; that mere calculation has been too much encouraged, and that the observation of practical facts, the deduction of inferences, the relation of cause and effect, and, in short, the *power of reasoning*, have been too much neglected. With this view, the committee have recommended to the Principal, that in the course of instruction to be pursued, more attention should be paid to the cultivation of independent thought, than has heretofore been bestowed upon it.

"This remark will apply equally well to schools of every grade. Young children are more easily taught through their powers of observation than by any other means. The abstract knowledge of facts in geography, or of principles in arithmetic, is difficult to be acquired by them, and is generally an effort of mere memory. It is consequently acquired without interest, and by dint of a force put upon the attention, which is greater than should

be expected from such young and tender minds; while, on the other hand, those same minds are interested, aroused, and taught to reason and to think, without effort and almost without knowing it, by illustration from common life. Thus, a simple story may be made the means of awakening interest, drawing out questions, illustrating principles, and conferring more educational benefit, than weeks of poring over dry rules, or abstract statements of fact. Children, as a general rule, should not be forced to learn what cannot be explained to their comprehension. Learning a fact or a principle merely by rote, adds nothing to practical, useful knowledge."

We cannot help thinking that this extract points to a very serious defect in much of the teaching in our schools. It is not, that the teaching *per se* is not good, but pains enough is not taken to adapt it closely to the wants, and connect it immediately with the experience of the child. The consequence is, that school and school learning stand in their minds as something apart from the rest of life, something which they take as a matter of course, with docility enough perhaps, but not seeing its real use and immediate application, not having it brought home to their own experience in any way, it awakens but a languid interest, makes but a faint impression, and is therefore soon effaced from their memory. The difference we speak of is not so much in the matter of the instruction, as in the manner. We will suppose two teachers, for instance, one with a dry and learned text-book on Mechanics, and a set of the most approved apparatus, elegant with mahogany, and glittering with brass and varnish, and another with no text-book at all, save the one at home in his own library, and for apparatus, we will say, the well-wheel and bucket in the yard, the fire-tongs by the stove, a rod and a few pound and ounce weights, a pair of scissors, and the school-room door. Which of those teachers is likely to give his pu-

pils of any grade below the High School, the clearer notions of the lever, and the wheel and axle? We say the former, if he has any teaching faculty; and if he has not, he ought not to be in the school-room. For in the one case the subject becomes a reality to the child, and is connected with what he already knows by his own little experience; in the other, the only association is with the dry text-book, and the glass doors of the apparatus-case. One pupil will see levers wherever they are to be found; he will make play-things levers, and curiously compare the different kinds, and if he has a mechanical turn, everything out of doors will develop it; while it is a chance if the other does not lock up his mechanical knowledge with the apparatus, and forget all about it till he is bored with the next lessons. Or suppose the subject to be Chemistry. Many a pedant teacher will manage to give learned instruction on oxygen and hydrogen and carbon, and manipulate with vessels of uncouth form, and dazzle his pupils' eyes with sparks, and blow himself up with explosions, and though it is good fun to the boys, (especially the blowing-up part,) yet they will not dream of connecting the subject with the bread they go home and eat for dinner, the china plate they eat from, the skins they pass hanging in the tan yard, or the soap their clothes are washed with. The utmost stretch of practical application will be perhaps to extend the subject as far as the apothecary, because his glass phials do look like those the teacher uses, and perhaps he writes himself chemist on his sign. We suppose the unhesitating faith with which his drugs are swallowed sometimes raises from the association with this still "occult" science.

Hence comes a wide-spread prejudice in the minds of many uneducated, but often very intelligent people against what they call "school-learning."—They think their children's brains are

"muddled" by it, and that they are spoiled for active and useful life. Better *not* to know such things, they say—they only spoil you for being useful. And so they cut short their children's education with the bare rudiments of reading, writing, and ciphering, put them early to a trade, which can never be to them, so ill prepared, any thing but mechanical drudgery for want of the very knowledge they thus, not without reason, are so prejudiced against.

We think there is ground for this prejudice. So many teachers cram all sorts of learning only that they in turn may cram their pupils with it, so many make a dull, lifeless routine out of the most pleasing and interesting of subjects, so many are led away by the foolish desire of seeming learned, and of attaining some higher, and in their view more dignified position, that we are afraid there is a sad amount of this routine and *ex-officio* teaching. We are greatly wanting in simplicity and homely thoroughness. Instead of being content with being more learned than we seem, we are too prone to desire to seem more learned than we are. The teacher who knows enough to become, with care and patience, a good primary instructor, is straining every nerve to get a grammar school, while the grammar teacher, instead of laboring zealously to protect himself in his most important sphere, is striving to rise to the dignity of the High School. For our part we believe that the last named is the easiest kind of teaching, and that the difficulty, delicacy, and real importance increases as we descend the scale.

There is, on the other hand, a very foolish prejudice in the minds of many half-thinkers, against anything bearing the name "practical." It immediately conjures up the image of Materialism, and the cry is raised, that schools are being unspiritualized. As though there were any necessary contradiction between the practical and the spiritual!

As though learning were vulgarized by being made useful! Is not this the old monkish ascetic doctrine which we all in words repudiate? What way so sure of elevating and spiritualizing the homely details of life, as that of teaching their scientific meaning, and showing thereby the literal truth of the word, Not a sparrow falleth to the ground without our Father,—that not the meanest event befalls in this great universe, but in obedience to those great laws that keep the stars in their courses? Is a piece of knowledge any less worthy to be known because it can be turned to a useful purpose?—does that render it any less dignified? Lord Bacon did not think so. Or is it inevitable that the knowledge of practically useful truth will be turned to some selfish and mercenary account? The history of all great discoverers and inventors contradicts it. Of this we are sure, that no firm foundation in the minds of youth for scientific knowledge, can be laid in abstractions, and that unless school knowledge is closely united with the child's own experience of life, it will be vain to hope for healthy progress, or look for maturity of fruit—*Mass. Teacher.*

Refusing to Commune.

Some time since we attended a sacramental meeting in a neighboring church and as we were distributing the elements, we observed a worthy Deacon sitting on the seats appropriated to the portion of the assembly that did not wish to partake of the ordinance.—Knowing him to be a very good man, we took occasion, after the service was over, to express our surprise and regret at seeing him in such a position. He replied that he had a personal difficulty in a pecuniary transaction with one of the members of the church, and having lost all confidence in his piety, could never again sit down at the same communion table with him. He seemed to think this a sufficient justification

for his course. I then asked him a single question. Do you consider yourself better than the Savior? He sat down to his own table with Judas, who, he knew, in a few hours would betray him, and was a thief from the beginning.

The question seemed to puzzle him, and we parted. But as we were about to leave the next day, he came and expressed his great sorrow for having acted as he did. We then took occasion to remark that there was a strong probability that he had harshly judged his brother, but if he had not, the other having done one wrong could never justify him in committing another wrong, in refusing to remember Christ. The command of the master was,—“Do this in remembrance of me.” The fact that another had defrauded him could never authorize him to defraud his Savior of that grateful and heartfelt remembrance of him, in his ordinance, which was his just due. He quoted the saying of the Savior—“If thou bring thy gift to the altar and there rememberest that thy brother has aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother and then come and offer thy gift.” We replied that that passage was not more applicable to the Lord’s Supper than it was to prayer, or any other approach to God; that if his interpretation of it was correct, he ought never to pray any more until he had settled his difficulty with his brother. We parted, and were happy to learn from him a short time since, that the train of thought then started in his mind, had led him to seek a reconciliation, and that he had been successful. Perhaps the same thoughts may be useful to some of our readers who have been guilty of similar folly with this good brother.

When will Christians learn that they should partake of the Lord’s Supper, because the Savior commanded them thus to do?—and that no course which

their brethren may take will justify them in neglecting that blessed institution?—*Mich. Chris. Herald.*

NEW PARIS, O. Sept. 12th, 1856.

BRO. JOHN BOGGS: You will please give notice in the Magazine, of the annual meeting of the Western district of Ohio, and the associated portion of Indiana, which session will commence Wednesday the 15th day of October next, at 2 o’clock P. M. at Bethel, Wayne County, Indiana.

Beloved brethren, we would earnestly solicit a representation of all the Congregations in the district, and not only a representation, but a liberal contribution for the support of the cause of our Master.

Two grand objects are now before us to stimulate our actions, first, that we may hold fast whereto we have now attained, second, that as far as we have the ability we may meet the calls that are continually sounding in our ears for the word of life. Beloved brethren, is it needful to say the church is the repository of this word and that you are divinely authorized and commissioned to sound it out even from sea to sea, and from the rivers to the ends of the earth? Nor does our mission cease until the angel standing with one foot upon the sea and the other on the land shall proclaim that Time shall be no more. In conclusion, as the question is often asked, How much am I under obligation to give, and there is only one correct answer to the question, namely, all that we have, after obtaining the necessary comforts of life, query, will not the guardian care of our heavenly Father be exercised towards the offspring of that man who is devoted to his cause, according to the answer above stated.

Brethren, answer the above named query in your own minds, and let its proper answer influence your contribution for the Lord’s cause.

JAMES P. KEMP, Secretary,
W. D. of O.

HYMN OF THE OLDEN TIME.

The following stanzas (which we take from a late number of the Independent,) comprise nearly the whole of the original ballad, from which the various editions of the beautiful hymn, found in nearly every hymn book in the country, and which commences "Jerusalem, my happy home," have their origin.

It is found in a recent work published in Edinburgh, by Johnson & Hunter, entitled "The New Jerusalem; a hymn of the Olden Time." General belief has assigned the authorship of the ballad to DAVID DICKSON, a minister of Scotland, a little before the middle of the seventeenth century. But the researches of the writer of this volume have discovered in the British Museum; a manuscript volume, which establishes for the hymn a more ancient origin. It bears evidence of being as old as the sixteenth century.

The ballad, although much longer than articles which have usually appeared in our "Poetical Department," we give verbatim, with the exception of four stanzas, believing that it will be acceptable to all our readers who have any love for the christian literature of the "Olden Time."

The book (says the Independent,) "includes not only an inquiry into the origin of this hymn, but a pleasing biographical sketch of its reputed author, and a copy of the hymn at full length, with various readings, an adduction of parallel passages, and similar hymns, both Latin and English, and other scholarly annotations."

The New Jerusalem.

1. O, Mother dear, *Jerusalem*,
When shall I come to thee?
When shall my sorrows have an end?
Thy joys when shall I see?
O, happy harbor of God's saints!
O, sweet and pleasant soil!
In thee no sorrow may be found,
No grief, no care, no toil!
2. In thee no sickness is at all,
No hurt, nor any sore;
There is no death, nor ugly sight,
But life forevermore.
No dimish clouds o'ershadow thee,
No dull nor darksome night;
But every soul shines as the sun,
For God himself gives light.
3. There lust nor lucre cannot dwell,
There envy bears no sway;
There is no hunger, thirst nor heat,
But pleasure every way.
Jerusalem! Jerusalem!
Would God I were in thee!
O that my sorrows had an end,
Thy joys that I might see.

4. No pains, no pangs, no grieving grief,
No woful wight is there;
No sigh, no sob, no cry is heard,
No well-away, no fear.
Jerusalem, the city is,
Of God our King alone;
The lamb of God, the light thereof,
Sits there upon his throne;
5. Oh! God, that I *Jerusalem*,
With speed may go behold—
For why? The pleasures there abound,
With tongue cannot be told.
Thy turrets and thy pinnacles
With carbuncles do shine;
With jasper, pearl and chrysolite,
Surpassing pure and fine.
6. Thy houses are of ivory,
Thy windows crystal clear,
Thy streets are laid with beaten gold,
Where angels do appear:
Thy walls are made of precious stones,
Thy bulwarks diamonds square,
Thy gates are made of orient pearl,
O God! if I were there.
7. Within thy gates no thing can come
That is not passing clean;
No spider's web, no dirt, no dust,
No filth may there be seen.
Jehovah, Lord, now come away,
And end my grief and plaints;
Take me to thy *Jerusalem*,
And place me with thy saints,
8. Who there are crown'd with glory great
And see God face to face;
They triumph still, and aye rejoice,
Most happy is their case.
But we that are in banishment,
Continually do moan;
We sigh, we mourn, we sob, we weep,
Perpetually we groan.
9. Our sweetness mixed is with gall,
Our pleasure is but pain,
Our joys not worth the looking on,
Our sorrows aye remain.
But there they live in such delight,
Such pleasure and such play;
That unto them a thousand years
Seem but as yesterday.
10. O my sweet home, *Jerusalem*,
Thy joys when shall I see;
Thy King sitting upon his throne,
And thy felicity.
Thy vineyards and thy orchards,
So wonderful and fair;
And furnished with trees and fruit,
Most beautiful and rare.
11. Thy gardens and thy goodly walks
Continually are green;
There grow such sweet and pleasant flowers
As nowhere else are seen;
There cinnamon and sugar grow,
There nard and balm abound;
No tongue can tell, no heart can think,
The pleasures there are found.

12. There nectar and ambrosia spring,
There musk and civet sweet;
There many a fine and dainty drug
Are trod down under feet.
Quite thro' the streets, with pleasant sound,
The flood of life doth flow;
Upon whose banks, on every side,
The trees of life do grow.

13. These trees each month do yield their fruit,
Forevermore they spring;
And all the nations of the world
To thee their honors bring.
Jerusalem, God's dwelling-place,
Full sore long I to see;
O that my sorrows had an end,
That I might dwell in thee?

14. *Jerusalem! Jerusalem!*
Thy joys fain would I see;
Come quickly, Lord, and end my grief,
And take me home to thee;
O print thy name in my forehead,
And take me hence away,
That I may dwell with thee in bliss,
And sing thy praises aye.

15. *Jerusalem*, thrice happy seat!
Jehovah's throne on high,
O sacred city, queen and wife
Of Christ eternally!
O comely Queen! with glory clad,
With honor and degree;
All fair thou art, exceeding bright,
No spot there is in thee!

16. I long to see *Jerusalem*,
The comfort of us all;
For thou art fair and beautiful,
None ill can thee befall.
In thee, *Jerusalem*, I say,
No darkness dare appear;
No night, no shade, no winter foul,
No time doth alter there;

17. No candle needs, no moon to shine,
No glistening stars to light,
For Christ the King of righteousness,
There ever shineth bright.
The lamb unspotted, white and pure,
To thee doth stand in lieu
Of light so great the glory is
Thine heavenly King to view.

18. The sheep and lambs, that hardly 'scaped
The snares of death and hell,
Triumph in joy eternally,
Whereof no tongue can tell.
And tho' the glory of each one
Doth differ in degree;
Yet is the joy of all alike
And common, as we see.

19. There love and charity doth reign,
And Christ is all in all;
Whom they most perfectly behold
In glory spiritual.
They love, they praise, they praise, they love,
They "Holy, Holy," cry;
They neither toil, nor faint, nor end,
But laud continually.

20. O, happy thousand times were I,
If, after wretched days,
I might with listening ears conceive
Those heavenly songs of praise—
Which to the eternal King are sung
By happy wights above,
By saved souls, and angels sweet,
Who love the God of love!

21. O passing happy were my state,
Might I be worthy found
To wait upon my God and King,
His praises there to sound!
And to enjoy my Christ above.
His favor and his grace;
According to his promise made—
Which here I interlace.

22. "O, Father dear," quoth he, "let them
Which thou hast put of old
To me be there, where lo! I am,
My glory to behold.
Which I with thee, before this world
Was laid in perfect wise,
Have had; from whence the fountain great
Of glory doth arise."

23. Again, "If any man will serve,
Then let him follow me;
For where I am, be thou right sure
There shall my servant be."
And still, "if any man love me,
Him loves my Father dear;
Him I do love; to him myself
In glory will appear."

24. Lord take away my misery,
That there I may behold,
With thee, in thy *Jerusalem*,
What there cannot be told.
And so in Zion see my King,
My love, my Lord, my all;
Whom now as in a glass I see,
There face to face I shall.

25. O, blessed are the pure in heart,
Their Sovereign they shall see!
And the most holy heavenly host,
Who of his household be.
O Lord, with speed dissolve my bands,
These gins and fetters strong,
For I have dwelt within the tents
Of *Kedar* over-long;

26. Yet search me, Lord, and find me out,
Fetch me thy fold unto;
That all the angels may rejoice,
While all thy will I do.
O, mother dear! *Jerusalem*,
When shall I come to thee?
When shall my sorrows have an end,
Thy joys when shall I see?

27. Yet once again I pray thee, Lord,
To quit me from all strife,
That to thine hill I may attain,
And dwell there all my life
With cherubim and seraphim,
And holy souls of men,
To sing thy praise, O God of Hosts,
For ever, and *Amen*!

For the N. W. Christian Magazine.

Letters to Alexander Campbell.

No. 6.

THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.

"The law in question, for reclaiming Fugitive servants is, to any ordinary mind most obvious and perfectly constitutional, and is so declared by the most learned and able Judges of the nation."—*Millennial Harbinger*: Vol. I, January, 1851, at page 30. Fourth series.

I again take up the constitution—I look and find these words: Art. 13 of the amendments of the Constitution—"Congress shall have power to make all necessary laws for the recovery of Fugitives from service or labor; and also, for the reclamation of Fugitive slaves." This language *seems* to remove all doubt as to the power of Congress over this matter. But you know "the glorious uncertainty of the law" has long since passed into a proverb. Perhaps *this* is even more than usually *uncertain*. It is related of our American sage, Franklin, that when at the Court of France, he was a member of the "Royal Academy of Science," and upon an occasion, he propounded this question to those speculative savans: "Why is it that a given quantity of water will weigh no more, with a living fish *in it*, than *without it*?" The savans all looked wise, and speculated as profoundly as the nature of the case admitted. But not satisfied with any answer given, they appealed to the Doctor, saying, "How do you explain the matter?" "I would first ascertain the *fact*," said the Doctor.—And now, if it should appear upon examination, that the aforesaid 13th article of the amendments belongs to the same category as Dr. Franklin's parable of Abraham and the poor man, which he read to some clerical guests, with whom he was debating the subject of religious toleration, from the 51st chapter of Genesis,—if it should *thus* appear, why, then, this Fugitive Slave Law may indeed be a thing of

wonderful contrivance and *power*, like the lever of Archimedes; but, like him, its *friends* and *supporters* must in their extremity exclaim, "*dos pou sto*"—"Give me whereon to stand." But I do advise all slaveholders and their apologists, to seek to establish this apocryphal article as canonical, for without it all foundation for the Fugitive Slave Bill "vanishes, like the baseless fabric of a vision."

I *here defy all criticism and all authority*, and assert that the third clause, of the second section, of the fourth article of the Constitution is a prohibition upon the States—nothing more—nothing less. It says in effect to the States, "You shall not make any law for the purpose of releasing any one from his obligations, who has fled from another State, where, by the laws of that State, he owed service or labor; but upon a claim being established, you shall, without *let or hindrance*, allow him to be taken back to the State from which he fled." This, "to an *ordinary mind*," as you say, or to "the home-bred, unsophisticated understanding," as Mr. Dallas would say, is the obvious meaning of the clause of the Constitution.

But you, like all advocates of this law, urge contemporaneous history to prove the *intentions* of the framers of that instrument! Now, I care not a feather, or a straw, what the *intentions* of the framers were—their *intentions* made no part of the thing *itself*!—And the *instrument itself* had no force until it was ordained and established by the people. "We, the People of these United States, do ordain and establish this Constitution." They establish no "private interpretation"—nor hidden meaning—nor secret intention of the scribes that drafted it; and cared no more for them than you would care for the *intentions* and private opinions of a Notary Public, that you employed to draft a land conveyance, or other instrument of

writing. And as to the opportunity enjoyed by the three millions and a half of the people for knowing the *intentions* of the framers of the Constitution, it was rather meager! There were probably some eight or ten newspapers published at the time, in all these United States—possibly rather more—I have not now the means of ascertaining precisely; but I remember an incident which may help a little in making a guess. When Franklin was wooing his future wife, the mother of the lady objected strongly, on the ground of “a living.” She said “there was already *one newspaper* published in Philadelphia, and she did not think that *another* would receive sufficient patronage to support a family.” No, the mass of the people knew not; they had no means of knowing the *intentions* of the framers of the Constitution.

But you assert in the article before quoted, that this Fugitive law is “only the spirit and letter of the Constitution of the United States.” Well, we have considered the *letter* a little; we will now inquire after the *spirit* and *intention*. We usually expect the design, the intention, the spirit of a book, to be set forth in the preface to the work. The authors of this work have given a preface, setting forth their design—their intention—the spirit of the instrument; they put these words—these plain, these emphatic words, into the mouths of the People: “We, the People of these United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, ensure Domestic Tranquillity, provide for the common Defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.” This, then, is the grand design of the work as a whole. “The whole is greater than its parts,” says philosophy; and, “the greater includes the less.” If, then,

any *one* of its *parts* stands opposed to the great whole, the part is a nullity! “So, depose logic and hermeneutics,” if I may venture to borrow a favorite phraseology of your own.

Every specification of the great object of the Constitution is distinctly against both the *letter* and *spirit* of this Fugitive Slave Law; or, rather, the Fugitive Law contravenes the Constitution, as a great whole, and in all its essential parts and features, as set forth in the preface to the work. It endangers the Union; it tramples on Justice; it destroys Domestic Tranquillity; it stands opposed to the general Welfare; and directly tends to the subversion of Liberty, both for ourselves and for our Posterity.

But I have nearly filled my sheet. I have not yet done with the Constitution; and then I have the *morality* of it to discuss; and then your “*Bible argument*”—the cases of Hagar and Onesimus—and one or two others that you probably overlooked.

Your brother, in the hope of the redemption of the Slave,

M. S. CLAPP.

For the N. W. Christian Magazine.

Letters to Alexander Campbell—No. 7.

We now turn again to the letter of the Constitution. With due deference to great names, I humbly conceive that it requires no casuist in the law to decide that the Fugitive law in question contravenes the seventh article of the Amendments of the Constitution, in denying the right of a trial by Jury to those claimed as slaves. Article seven of the Amendment, says: “In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved.” I am thankful for having the “*onus probandi*” in this case taken off my shoulders as you have done by the authority you have quoted—Judge Grier. In a given case he released the alleged Fugitive for the rea-

son which he thus gives : The claimant "not having availed himself of the privileges and facilities given him, by the act of Congress for this purpose, we decided that he must be bound by the common law rules of evidence, *as in other cases where a title to property has been established before a court.*"

This is the distinct assertion by one of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, that the claim to a fugitive slave, is a common law case of controversy about property ! Then, if the property claimed exceed twenty dollars, the Constitution demands a jury trial. The only question that can be raised, constitutionally, after this admission, is, *where* shall the trial be ? Judge Grier says the trial should be "in the country, from which the person demanded, has escaped." Let us consider this matter a little. Suppose a citizen of Virginia passing through this region espies my horse—one that I have had in quiet possession for two years—he says the horse is his—he was stolen from him in Virginia. Recollect I am discussing a question of *law* now, and not of *religion*, and I ask should I allow him to take the horse quietly away, telling him that I will cheerfully be at the trouble and expense of taking witnesses to Virginia, and he may carry the matter where he has plenty of friends, and I have none, and where he could get a hundred witnesses to prove any thing he chooses ? No, sir ! "Possession is *nine* points in the law," is a proverb, and I shall not relinquish my advantage. But take another illustration, that would be much more interesting in your region.—Suppose the case of a slave—not a fugitive, claiming himself—but a slave in the peaceable possession of a master, and at work—a rival claimant from another State appears, and says this slave was stolen from him in another State. How would Judge Grier decide now ? "*Possession is nine points in the law,*" says Judge Grier ; the possessor cannot

yield his advantage—the proof lies upon the rival claimant, and he must establish his title to the slave *where* he was *found* in peaceful possession.

But say you, "this is another case—and *very* different !" No doubt of it ; the cases are wide as the poles apart—there is just the difference that there would be between a case of church discipline with a rich respectable man, and a case with a poor man ! All the difference in the world, you see !! But in the light of law and justice the cases are precisely the same.—In the light of popular prejudice, O, how different ?

That same fugitive might be possessed of a *cow* valued at twenty-five dollars, and no living man could lawfully take her from him, without a trial by jury ; but if *himself* is claimed—valued at one thousand dollars by his master, it may be fifteen hundred—valued by *himself* at a sum *untold*, he may be hurried away with the miserable mockery that he could have a trial in the lands of whips and chains—of blood hounds and thumb screws—in a land where, if one thousand of his own color could swear that he was born a free man,—they would be dumb before the law, where the man that dares show sympathy with the victim of oppression, is warned to flee for his life !! And such is the place where the fugitive is told he may have a trial by jury !!

"O ! Justice ! Thou art fled to brutish beasts !
And *men* have lost their reason !"

And now, as you have introduced Judge Grier to us, I will venture to introduce *myself* to *him*—for I have something to say to him. And now I address myself to Judge Grier.

Judge Grier, although you occupy a *high* position, and I, a *low* one, nevertheless, as the celebrated Indian Chief Black Hawk is reported to have said to President Jackson, when introduced to him : "You are a man—I am another." As for pedigree, I be-

long to a very ancient family—their roll of lineage extends to Adam—probably yours does not go much beyond that! And now, if it be settled that we both belong to the *genus homo*, we are so nearly equal—every matter of difference between us being purely factitious, I shall look thee full in the face and tell thee my opinion concerning thee. In the first place I think thee ignorant; and in the second place I think thy integrity is not like the virtue of Cæsar's wife, "above suspicion." The reasons for this opinion are contained in thy decision which lies before me. In the first place you gravely assume that the case of a Fugitive is a common law case of property! *me bien*, as the Frenchman would say. Then he has a right to a trial by jury, and *that* where he is found in the quiet possession of himself.

You doubtless saw this—and so with the facility with which a traveling juggler shuffles a piece of silver from one hat to another, you shuffle this case into the *Criminal Code*—and talk of the *guilt* of the person who has escaped!! Yes, he is guilty—O, how guilty!! guilty of wearing a dark skin—one that nature gave him—guilty of dire misfortune—guilty of being the victim of cruel oppression—of terrible injustice!! Alas! Alas!

"There is no *flesh* in man's obdurate heart!

"It does not feel for man!

"He finds his fellow guilty of a skin

"Not colored like his own,

"And having power to enforce the wrong,

"For such a worthy cause,

"Chains him and tasks him,

"And exacts his sweat, with stripes,

"That Mercy, with a bleeding heart

"Weeps, when she sees inflicted on a beast."

After all, "the unpardonable sin"—the *ineffaceable* guilt of the slave, which,

"Nor running brooks, nor *flood* nor *sea*,

"Can wash the *dismal stain* away,"

—that guilt is his *meek*, his *patient* submission to *cruel wrong*—to flagrant injustice—to *iron-hoofed* oppression! If Charles Sumner had risen quick as

the lightning's flesh, and plunged a bowie-knife deep into the heart's core of Preston S. Brooks, he would have been honored by the entire South—he would have been, "a gentleman and a scholar." Why does this nation admire and honor the aboriginal inhabitants of this country? Because they will submit to torture, but *not* to slavery!

But I must close for the present. I must respectfully request Mr. Campbell to step back and listen for a little until I get through with your Honor.

With sentiments of due consideration,

I remain, yours truly,

M. S. CLAPP.

Eternity of God.

While the spirituality of his nature places him beyond the reach of our direct cognizance, there are certain other essential properties of his nature which place him beyond the reach of our possible comprehension. Let me instance the past eternity of the Godhead. One might figure a futurity that never ceases to flow, and which has no termination; but who can climb his ascending way among the obscurities of that Infinite which is behind him? Who can travel in thought along the track of generations gone by, till he has overtaken the eternity which lies in that direction? Who can look across the millions of ages which have elapsed, and from an ulterior post of observation, look again to another and another succession of centuries, and at each further extremity in this series of retrospects, stretch backward his regards on antiquity as remote and indefinite as ever. Could we, by any number of successive strides over these mighty intervals at length reach the fountain-head of duration, our spirits might be at rest. But to think of duration as having no fountain-head, to think of time with no beginning, to uplift the imagination along the heights of an antiquity which hath positively